

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No: 10/072,353
Applicant: James H. Buchanan et al.
Filed: February 7, 2002
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR TOPOLOGY CONSTRAINED
ROUTING POLICY PROVISIONING
Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Robert W. Wilson
Docket: 131105.1004
Customer No.: 32914

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Sir:

This communication is in response to the Interview Summary mailed November 21, 2007. A reply in response to the last Office action was filed after receipt of the Interview Summary.

It is respectfully submitted that there has been a misunderstanding between the applicant's representative and the examiner on a couple of points. The examiner states,

Applicant's representative and the examiner disagreed on the interpretation of "automatically generating a least one route distribution rule". The examiner interpreted it to mean that the configuration provisioning software provisions rules into each router and those rules define the relationship between the sites and these provided rules constraint [sic] the routes distributioned [sic] between the router." Applicant's representative stated that the routers automatically created a new rule.

Applicant's representative recalls trying to explain that the rules referenced in the claim are for constraining distribution of routes, and that the rules are automatically generated based on the topology graphically defined through a user interface and then provisioned to the nodes. Please note that the preamble of claim 1 states that it is a "method for provisioning routing policy." The examiner explained that he had once programmed routers and that the routers automatically configured themselves. Applicant pointed out that the claims pertained to provisioning of rules on how routes are distributed by network elements, such as routers, constituting the VPN, but that the routers themselves learned the VPN routes from customers and other routers within the VPN and shared those routes with other routers within the VPN. Applicant's representative is unaware of routers automatically generating rules representing policy on constraining import of routes from and/or export of routes to other elements within the VPN or to the customer site.

Applicant's representative made the additional point that the Cisco reference, which is a manual describing how to set VPNs and routers, made no reference to automatically generating the rules (e.g. import and export filters).

Dated: December 4, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

//Marc A. Hubbard//

Marc A. Hubbard

Registration No. 32,506

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

3000 Thanksgiving Tower
1601 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
(214) 999-4880 - Telephone
(214) 999-3880 - Facsimile